Report No. ATH51

Stantec Analytical Validation Cr	iecklist Report No. A i no i	
Project Name: Amtrak Wilmington	Project Number: 213402048	
Validator: Sarah Von Raesfeld	h Von Raesfeld Laboratory: Eurofins/Lancaster Laboratory	
Date Validated: 02/26/2018 Laboratory Project Number: 1899297 / ATH51		
Sample Start-End Date: 01/18/2018	Laboratory Report Date: 02/02/2018	
Parameters Validated: VOCs by USEPA Method TO-15		
Samples Validated:		
Basement-2, ELLE # 9416789		
D. 4.4.0 ELLE #. 0.44.0=0.0		

RM-119, ELLE # 9416790

Basement-1, ELLE # 9416791

RM-242, ELLE # 9416792

RSE-H, ELLE # 9416793

RM-100, ELLE # 9416794

Hallway Mail, ELLE # 9416795

RM-200, ELLE # 9416796

AA-2, ELLE # 9416797

AA-1, ELLE # 9416798

RM-129A, ELLE # 9416799

Mech H, ELLE # 9416800

B8-1, ELLE # 9416801

B14-1, ELLE # 9416802

B14-B, ELLE # 9416803

B15-1, ELLE # 9416804

B18-1, ELLE # 9416805

B5-1, ELLE # 9416806

B5-2, ELLE # 9416807

B4-1, ELLE # 9416808

VALIDATION CRITERIA CHECK

Validation Flags Applicable to this Review:

- U The analyte was analyzed for, but not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit.
- **J** The analyte was positively identified; the associated numerical value is the approximate concentration of the analyte in the sample.
- **J+** Result is estimated quantity but the result may be biased high.
- **J-** Result is estimated quantity but the result may be biased low.
- **UJ** The analyte was not detected above the reported sample quantitation limit. However, the reported quantitation limit is approximate and may or may not represent the actual limit of quantitation necessary to accurately and precisely measure the analyte in the sample.
- **NJ** The analysis indicates the presence of an analyte that has been "tentatively identified" and the associated numerical value represents its approximate concentration.
- **B** The analyte was detected in the method, field, and/or trip blank.
- R The sample results are rejected due to serious deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and meet quality control criteria. The presence or absence of the analyte cannot be verified.

1.	Were all the analyses requested for the samples	Yes	No
	submitted with each COC completed by the lab?	X	
Co	mments: None		

Report No. ATH51

2.	Did the laboratory identify any non-conformances related to the analytical result?	Yes	No
Com	ments: None		X
		Voc	No
3.	Were sample Chain-of-Custody forms complete?	Yes X	No
Com	ments: None	^	
		.,	
4.	Were samples received in good condition and at the appropriate temperature?	Yes X	No
Com	ments: None		
5.	Were sample holding times met?	Yes	No
		X	
Com	ments: None		
6.	Were correct concentration units reported?	Yes	No
		X	
Com	ments: None		
7.	Were detections found in laboratory blank samples?	Yes	No
Com	ments: None		Х
8. blan	Were detections found in field blank, equipment rinse k, and/or trip blank samples?	Yes	No
Com	ments: Not Applicable.		
9.	Were instrument calibrations within method criteria?	Yes	No
Com	ments: Not Applicable, Level II data validation.		
10.	Were surrogate recoveries within control limits?	Yes	No
Com	ments: Not Applicable		
11.	Were laboratory control sample(s) (LCS/LCSD) sample	Yes	No
reco	veries within control limits?	X	
Com	ments: None		
12. limits	Were matrix spike (MS/MSD) recoveries within control s?	Yes	No
Com	ments: Not applicable, site-specific MS/MSDs not analyzed.		
13.	Were RPDs within control limits?	Yes	No
		X	
Com	ments: LCS/LCSD RPDs were within acceptance criteria. Site-specif	ic MS/MSDs were n	ot analyze

Report No. ATH51

	_			•	
14.	Were dilutions requ	uired on any samples?		Yes	No X
Comi	ments: None				
15.	Were Tentatively lo	dentified Compounds (TIC) pro	esent?	Yes	No
					Х
Com	ments:				
16.	Were organic syste	em performance criteria met?	NA	Yes X	No
Com	ments: None				
17.	Were GC/MS inter	nal standards within method c	riteria? NA	Yes X	No
Comi	ments: None				
18.	Were inorganic sys	stem performance criteria met	? NA X	Yes	No
Com	ments: Not Applica	ble			
19. Were blind field duplicates collected? If so, discuss the precision (RPD) of the results.			Yes	No X	
Comi	ments: Not Applica	ble			
	Were at least 10 pellectronic Data Deli	ercent of the hard copy results verable Results?	s compared to	Yes X	No Initials SVR
Comi	ments: None				
21.	Other?			Yes	No
Com	ments: All samples	s validated according to USEP	A NFG 2014		
	PRECISION, ACC	CURACY, METHOD COMPLIA	ANCE AND COMPI	ETENESS ASS	SESSMENT
Preci	sion:	Acceptable X	Unaccepta	able Init	ials R
Com	ments: None				
Sens	itivity:	Acceptable X	Unaccepta	able Init	ials /R
Comi	ments: None	<u> </u>		I	
Accu	racy:	Acceptable X	Unaccepta		ials VR
	ments: None	<u> </u>	1	ı	
Com	monto. None				
	esentativeness:	Acceptable X	Unaccepta	able Init	ials R

Report No. ATH51

Method Compliance:	Acceptable X	Unacceptable	Initials SVR	
Comments: None				
Completeness:	Acceptable X	Unacceptable	Initials SVR	
Comments: None				